

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/726,922	12/02/2003	Deva N. Pattanayak	VISH-8728	8797	
7590 06/26/2006		EXAMINER			
Eric J. Gash			FENTY, JESSE A		
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP Third Floor Two North Market Street San Jose, CA 95113			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2815 DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/726,922	PATTANAYAK ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jesse A. Fenty	2815	

•	LAGIIIIICI	AILOIIIL				
	Jesse A. Fenty	2815				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 30 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 		in the final rejection, wh	ichever is later. In			
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire t Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•		the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		maliant Amandment	(DTOL 224)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphant Amendment	(F10L-324).			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		II be entered and an o	explanation of			
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	ned.			
11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's Declaration of Prior Invention does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131. Simply furnishing of photocopies of the original drawings and records is insufficient as presented to meet applicant's burden of proof.

An accompanying exhibit need not support all claimed limitations, provided that any missing limitation is supported by the declaration itself. Ex parte Ovshinsky, 10 USPQ2d 1075 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989). Here, applicant does not explain how the accompanying exhibit corresponds to any of the claimed subject matter.

The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice "amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). In re Borkowski, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974). Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant. 505 F.2d at 718-19, 184 USPQ at 33. In this case, applicant avers that "the invention of the present application was reduced to practice at least by the date of November 19, 2002," but does not further explain the relevance of the exhibit. For example, there are no test results of a working device. Applicant has perhaps shown "conception," but there is no corresponding showing of diligence to meet the requirement.

For these reasons, the Final Rejection of 02/09/06 is maintained.

See also MPEP 715.07 and 2138.05.

JEROME JACKSON PRIMARY EXAMINER